

## Today's Topics:

ARRL  
 ARRL Membership? (2 msgs)  
 crystals for a Heathkit HW 101  
 Edmund's Solar pack  
 MEA CULPA  
 PL259 connector assembly

Date: 14 Oct 89 06:03:36 GMT

From: portal!cup.portal.com!roblingelbach@uunet.uu.net (R A Lingelbach)

Subject: ARRL

The following is a list of MCI Mail addresses for ARRL officials, including an address for the league headquarters. I have sent email to every Director, at one time or another, and it's my experience that either some never receive their email or they just don't bother to respond....other Directors are very responsive.

=====  
 MCI Mail Information  
 for ARRL Officials  
 =====  
 [12/31/88 -- W3VS]

ARRL Directors				
Division	MCI ID	Name	Organization	Location
Atlantic	299-3599	Hugh A. Turnbull	ARRL	College Park,
Central	257-8370	Edmond A. Metzger	ARRL	Springfield, I
Dakota	282-3926	Howard Mark	ARRL	Burnsville, MN
Delta	311-9747	Joel Harrison		Judsonia, AR
Gt. Lakes	256-2032	Leonard M. Nathanson	ARRL	Southfield, MI
Hudson	253-2026	Stephen Mendelsohn	ARRL	Little Ferry,
Midwest	298-1574	Paul Grauer	ARRL	Wilson, KS
N. England	234-9723	Tom Frenaye	ARRL	Unionville CT
Northwest	316-5678	Rush Drake	American Radio	La Center, WA
Pacific	280-5867	Rodney J. Stafford	ARRL	San Jose, CA
Roanoke	267-1037	Gay E. Milius	ARRL	Virginia Beach
Rocky Mtn.	241-7097	Marshall Quiat		Denver, CO
Southeast	311-3659	Frank M. Butler, Jr.	ARRL	Fort Walton Be
Southwest	254-2030	Fried Heyn	ARRL	Costa Mesa, CA
West Gulf	212-3404	Jim Haynie	Jim Haynie Co.	Dallas, TX

ARRL Vice Directors				
Division	MCI ID	Name	Organization	Location

Atlantic	319-6890	Jim Mozley	American Radio	Camillue, NY
Gt. Lakes	267-1561	Allan L. Severson	ARRL	Lakewood, OH
Hudson	316-6907	Paul Vydareny	American Radio	North Tarrytow
N. England	307-5870	Robert B. Weinstock	American Radio	Silver Spring,
Northwest	341-1427	Bill Shrader	American Radio	Medford, OR
Roanoke	343-1429	John Kanode	American Radio	Boyce, VA
Southeast	365-2196	Evelyn Gauzens	American Radio	Miami, FL
Southwest	254-2027	Wayne Overbeck	ARRL	Garden Grove,
West Gulf	275-4569	Thomas W. Comstock	ARRL	College Statio

ARRL Officers				
Title	MCI ID	Name	Organization	Location
President	215-5162	Larry E. Price	ARRL	Statesboro, GA
Exec. VP	264-6149	David Sumner	ARRL	Newington, CT
1st VP	258-2034	Jay A. Holladay	ARRL	La Canada, CA
VP	227-2665	George S. Wilson	ARRL	Owensboro, KY
VP	276-1068	Clyde O. Hurlbert	ARRL	Biloxi, MS
Intl Affr	246-8130	Tod Olson	ARRL	Long Lake, MN
Secretary	224-2662	Perry F. Williams	ARRL	Newington, CT
Main Offc	215-5052	American Radio Relay Leagu	ARRL HQ	Newington, CT

UUCP: sun!portal!cup.portal.com!roblingelbach  
 INTERNET: roblingelbach@cup.portal.com  
 AMPRNET: kb6cun@kb6cun.ampr.org [44.16.0.106]  
 PACKET RADIO: KB6CUN@K6IYK.#SOCAL.USA.NA

-----  
 Rob Lingelbach (213) 464-6266 (voice)  
 2641 Rinconia Dr 464-0827 (data)  
 Los Angeles, CA 90068

-----  
 Date: 13 Oct 89 17:45:31 GMT  
 From: cica!ctrsol!uakari.primite.wisc.edu!ginosko!usc!henry.jpl.nasa.gov!  
 elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!peregrine!ccicpg!cci632!dvh@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (David  
 Hallidy)  
 Subject: ARRL Membership?

In article <6795@ttidca.TTI.COM>, sorgatz@ttidca.TTI.COM ( Avatar) writes:  
 > In article <2371@ge-dab.GE.COM> byrnes@sunwhere1.UUCP (Arthur Byrnes) writes:  
 > +QST already had too little technical content, and too much  
 > +"Contesting".  
 >  
 (some good stuff deleted for space- read the original post)

> If the membership that is interested in things-technical were to mount a  
> unified campaign to bring this to their attention I think they'd be forced  
> into putting some quality tech articles and columns back into each monthly  
> issue.

(some more good stuff deleted for space- same reason)

> +Just the other day a saw a note here that says they can get usenet  
> +E-mail, but "They are not interested".  
> How many of you would be willing to compose and send me  
> a copy of a letter to be sent to K1ZZ David Sumner?? Let's tell him what we  
> think of this situation. Maybe we can make a difference, together.

This posting basically says it all in a nutshell. The sad thing is, we  
can write all day long to K1ZZ, BUT HE WON'T ANSWER. I wrote a letter  
to him regarding the "New Frontier" cancellation, but he didn't take  
the time to respond directly- he passed the letter to Paul Rinaldo, who  
answered with what appears to be a FORM LETTER generated to "calm the  
troubled waters" stirred up by these actions.

Maybe if enough people write en masse, he might feel inclined to answer-  
it's worth a try, and my letter will be forthcoming to you directly.  
BTW- if you ever try to CALL K1ZZ, you can't reach him either- he's  
always "in a meeting".

Dave KD5RO

-----

Date: 13 Oct 89 18:28:40 GMT  
From: cica!ctrsol!uakari.primite.wisc.edu!ginosko!usc!henry.jpl.nasa.gov!  
elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!peregrine!ccicpg!cci632!dvh@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (David  
Hallidy)  
Subject: ARRL Membership?

In article <228@ssc.UUCP>, tad@ssc.UUCP (Tad Cook) writes:

>  
(ARRL's MCIMAIL address deleted)

>  
> Also, regarding all the whining over the cutbacks of "New Frontier",  
> this represented about 8% of what they cut. If this represented  
> the interests of a large percentage of the readership, they would  
> not have cut it. As it is, microwave operation is done by a tiny  
> percentage of ARRL members, yet the league is continuing to support  
> it with other publications.

Tad, you apparently are not a microwave enthusiast. That's fine, and you are certainly free to enjoy whatever part of ham radio you are involved with. I strongly suspect, however, that if your "niche" in this hobby were threatened (whether it be DX, Packet, SSTV, RTTY or whatever), you would also "whine" (your words not mine-see above). In case you haven't heard, ARRL has proposed to the FCC a no-code license which, if adopted, will give operating privileges to many people, on the very frequencies they have stopped covering on a regular basis. Right now, we are a small minority, as you correctly stated. However, as you can see, future happenings are likely to change that. Also, the microwave bands account for over 90% of our amateur allocations. If we don't promote activity there, our position with respect to keeping our allocations in the face of mounting commercial pressures, will be severely weakened.

It is true, to a degree, that the League is publishing SOME microwave oriented material, in the form of proceedings of the various VHF/UHF/Microwave conferences. This is a GIANT step in the right direction. However, think about who reads this material- not the person who is unaware of the capabilities of the microwave bands- he doesn't know WHY HE SHOULD be reading these publications. The people who read them are the ones who already are on the bands, or are at least contemplating such activity. The "New Frontier" was a vehicle, much like others in the magazine such as "How's DX", "On Line" and others, which bring more up-to-date (and somewhat less technical) information to the "unwashed masses".

It seems short-sighted to not give these portions of our allocation proper coverage, especially when you note the TREMENDOUS growth that has taken place there over the last few years- largely, I suspect, due to the efforts of Bob Atkins in his column (THANKS, BOB), and Joe Reisert in his ex- HAM RADIO column (THANKS, JOE). I've been licensed 24 years, and the first 20 were spent below 30 MHz. I moved up largely as a result of the efforts of some friends who detected my frustration with "You're 59, please QSL" type QSO's. A lot of other ex-HF people are on the VHF and above bands (K5YY and K5UR are two quick examples- BIIIIIG DX and contest types, both), and for the same reasons- the challenge of HF is largely gone. There are still some frontiers to cross on the microwave bands, though, and if we don't promote activity there, we'll lose the allocations and WE'LL ALL BE STUCK ON 20 METERS. I WILL NOT GO BACK- I will give up the hobby before I go back to the shit on 20 meters! Or 40, or 80. Lots of others feel the same. We're a minority now, but our numbers are increasing fast!

I've "whined" enough. Sorry for the length of this posting, but you and others need to know where we "microwavers" are coming from.

73                Dave Hallidy    KD5R0

-----  
Date: 14 Oct 89 01:42:41 GMT  
From: hpda!hpcupt1!bmp@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU (Brian M. Perkin)  
Subject: crystals for a Heathkit HW 101

International Crystal Manufacturing  
P. O. Box 26330,  
701 W. Sheridan,  
Oklahoma City, OK  
73126-0330

800-426-9825  
405-236-3741

(This is not an endorsement.)

-----  
Date: 13 Oct 89 17:47:50 GMT  
From: ingr!b11!herbster@uunet.uu.net (Joe Herbster)  
Subject: Edmund's Solar pack

Sorry for the confusion, i feel compelled to post the real stats.

The item i thought was expensive, probably is, and reads as follows from the catalog;

SOLAR POWER PACK -- portable & rechargeable. Provides electrical power to operate ..... Power output can be switched for 6 or 12v. Contains 36 solar cells encapsulated on aluminum substrate. Blocking diode prevents overcharge. Unit can be recharged by sunlight or from any 12v vehicle. Battery is new Gates cyclon high-power sealed lead acid rechargeable type. High impact carry case. Two models.....

12v at 2.5A 30w (12.25 x 9.25 x 4.25") \$219.00  
12v at 8.0A 96w (13.5 x 10.5 x 4.25") \$440.00

The solar array is built into the lid of the case and is less than a square foot of area. It is obvious that the solar array is only a trickle charger for the battery. No amp-hour rating provided.

And the EPA will be after me for my water wheel.....anyone have some more creative ideas for spinning an automotive alternator??

de KM4JN

-----  
Date: 14 Oct 89 05:06:27 GMT  
From: zebolskyd%byuvax.BITNET@jade.Berkeley.EDU  
Subject: MEA CULPA

In <5151@cbnewsm.ATT.COM>, KA1GT writes:  
>Sorry, I didn't know "for sales" were taboo

Heck, Bob, don't worry about it. It isn't as though the FCC was going to jerk your ticket. Other newsgroups allow (or apparently tolerate) such "for sale" postings, and it would be a natural mistake to make. I sure didn't know there was any such prohibition. And if anyone flames at you or tries to put you down for an honest mistake, they are neither a gentleman nor a scholar, and don't belong on the air or at a keyboard.

--Lyle D. Gunderson N6KSZ  
zebolskyd@yvax.byu.edu  
-----

Date: 14 Oct 89 12:16:45 GMT  
From: wa3wbu!john@uunet.uu.net (John Gayman)  
Subject: PL259 connector assembly

In article <2538@dogie.macc.wisc.edu>, kleemann@vms.macc.wisc.edu (Brad Kleemann) writes:

> >I picked up some RG-8/X coax, some PL259 connectors (silver plated) and  
>                   ^^^^^^  
> ARE YOU SURE?!? The adapters are for the smaller RG-58/U ONLY!  
> PL-259's are meant to handle RG/8 or RG/11 DIRECTLY!  
> >the UG-176 adapters for the connectors at a local hamfest. I want to  
> >build up some better coax for my dipole than what I am using now.  
> >

Amphenol lists two different adapters for the PL-259 in thier catalog:

UG-175 -- RG-55,58,141,142 (.209" I.D.)  
UG-176 -- RG-59,62,71,140,210 (.257" I.D.)

They list nothing for RG-8/X specifically. In the back of my mind I seem to recall that Radio Shack had an adapter that would handle RG-8/X but I could be mistaken. My Belden catalog lists RG-8/X as having an O.D. of .242", so it looks like the UG-176 adapter should accomidate it.

John

--

John Gayman, WA3WBU  
1869 Valley Rd.  
Marysville, PA 17053

|  
|  
|

UUCP: uunet!wa3wbu!john  
ARPA: john@wa3wbu.uu.net  
Packet: WA3WBU @ WB3EAH

-----

End of INFO-HAMS Digest V89 Issue #767  
\*\*\*\*\*